

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 11-14 and 19 have been amended. Claims 11-21 are pending and under consideration.

## ENTRY AFTER FINAL:

The foregoing claim changes simply clarify the originally intended meaning. It is submitted that the claim amendment should be entered at this final stage of prosecution because they do not require further search and/or consideration. The claimed amendments were not presented previously because it was not known they were necessary. Specifically, applicants did not understand that any interpretation of the claims could read on U.S. Patent No. 5,719,921 to Vysotsky et al. The claimed amendments simply confirm that the examiner's interpretation is not correct.

## THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION:

The sole issue raised in the outstanding office action is a rejection of claims 11-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,719,921 to Vysotsky et al.

Vysotsky teaches a system for activating telephone services in response to speech. In this system, speaker dependent and speaker independent speech recognition is performed in parallel. See column 7, lines 34-37. The output of both the speaker dependent and the speaker independent speech recognition steps are supplied to the input of an arbitration step. The arbitration step is used to arbitrate between the results of the speech recognition types by means of confidence measures or time alignment information (see col. 9, lines 23-29).

To the contrary, the invention claimed in claim 11 uses a selector connected to a plurality of speech recognition modules. The selector routes an input signal to one of the speech recognition models according to the type of speech recognition needed to process the input signal. The type needed to process the input signal is identified in the input signal. Independent claim 19 recites similar, but somewhat different features.

According to the system disclosed in Vysotsky et al., the input signal is supplied to all of the speech recognition modules, and then depending on the output signal, the arbitrator of the system identifies the best recognition result. Instead, the selector according to the present invention has a different task. That is, the selector routes the input signal (not the output signal) to the recognition module before the recognition takes place.

Independent claim 11 recites that the selector routes the input signal to one of the modules while excluding the input signal from another of the modules. According to independent claim 11, the routing is performed for processing the input signal only in the module to which the input signal is routed. Vysotsky et al. does not disclose or suggest these features.

As a result of the differences between the claimed invention and Vysotsky, there are a number of potential advantages. For example, the computing capacity required for speech recognition and the processing resources required for speech output are considerably reduced. This is because the process uses a module optimally adapted for the speech. For additional advantages, the Examiner is referred to page 14, line 13 thru page 15, line 8 of the specification.

In addition to the above, the claims require plurality of speech output modules. The examiner position on this point is not clear. In Vysotsky, there is only one speech output module implicitly disclosed, for outputting a confirmation message – see column 10, lines 37 and 38. A voice verification module does not require a speech output module. That is, the voice verification is used to verify the voice of the user, and therefore usually displays the information to be spoken by the user. Regardless of the speech output module deficiency, it is submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over Vysotsky et al. as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is submitted that the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 5 2006

By: Mark J. Henry  
Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501